

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 16, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further prosecution of this application, each of the issues raised in the Office Action is addressed herein.

In this paper, no claims have been amended, added or canceled.

Claims 1 to 37, 53 to 56, 61 to 66, 68, 69, 71 to 92, 95 to 129, 143 to 152, 154 to 157, 166 to 213, 229 to 232, 237 to 242, 244 to 246, 248 to 309 and 323-341 are pending for examination, of which claims 1, 26, 32, 53, 61, 65, 68, 71, 126, 143, 154, 166, 177, 202, 208, 229, 237, 241, 244, 248, 306, 323, 335 and 337 are independent claims. The Application as now presented is believed to be in allowable condition.

A. **REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER AND SUPERVISORY EXAMINER**

Given the various issues raised in connection with the Office Action dated June 16, 2006 and various circumstances surrounding the present application as discussed in detail below, Applicants formally request a telephone interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor as soon as possible. Applicants have made several attempts since the June 16, 2006 Office Action to schedule such an interview by making multiple requests with the Examiner by telephone, but to no avail. In a recent telephone conversation between Applicants' representative and Examiner Minh Dieu A on October 12, 2006, the Examiner indicated that he would endeavor to schedule such an interview immediately following the filing of this response, but would be unable to do so prior to the preparation and filing of this response.

Applicants' representative will follow-up with the Examiner shortly regarding the scheduling of a telephone interview to discuss the various issues addressed in this paper.

B. **REPEATED NOTICE OF COPIED CLAIMS PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§41.202(a)(1) and 10.23(c)(7)**

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§41.202(a)(1) and 10.23(c)(7), Applicants first notified the Office in a previous response dated January 17, 2006 that claims 323-341 of the present

application were copied from U.S. Application Serial No. 10/075,520, filed February 13, 2002, naming Duncan Kerr as an inventor (hereinafter, the “Kerr” application). In particular, claims 323-341 are identical to claims 20-38 of the Kerr application.

The Kerr application was published on December 19, 2002 as publication no. US-2002-0190975. Compliance with 35 U.S.C. §135(b)(2) is not at issue, because the present application was filed on October 23, 2001, i.e., prior to the publication of the Kerr application.

Following Applicants’ initial notice to the Office in Applicants’ previous response dated January 17, 2006, the Office Action dated June 16, 2006 was issued in the present application. No acknowledgment was made in this Office Action regarding the copied claims. Upon receipt of the present Office Action, Applicants’ representative immediately contacted the Examiner by telephone to discuss the circumstance of the copied claims on several occasions throughout June, July and August 2006, and each time encouraged the Examiner to discuss these circumstances with his supervisor as well as an interference specialist.

With respect to the Kerr application, during this same time period claims 20-31 of the Kerr application were cancelled in an amendment, and the Kerr application was allowed and ultimately issued on September 26, 2006 as Patent No. 7,113,196. Claims 32-38 of the Kerr application were renumbered as claims 1-7 of Patent No. 7,113,196.

Accordingly, Applicants’ presently pending claims 335-341 are identical to claims 1-7 of Patent No. 7,113,196.

Patent No. 7,113,196 claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) to the following two provisional applications:

Serial No. 60/298,364, filed June 15, 2001, and entitled “ACTIVE ENCLOSURE FOR COMPUTING DEVICE;” and

Serial No. 60/315,571, filed August 28, 2001, and entitled “COMPUTING DEVICE WITH DYNAMIC ORNAMENTAL APPEARANCE.”

The present application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) to several provisional applications, including Serial No. 60/277,911, filed March 22, 2001, and entitled “SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR DIGITAL ENTERTAINMENT.” Accordingly, the provisional application to which the present application claims priority predates both of the provisional applications to which Patent No. 7,113,196 claims priority.

As discussed in Applicants' previous response dated January 17, 2006, the subject matter of claims 323-341 is supported throughout the specification of the present application as well as in provisional application Serial No. 60/277,911. In particular, specific support for the feature of "extending the feel of a screen display to a housing that surrounds the screen display" may be found at least on page 16, line 14 through page 17, line 4 of Serial No. 60/277,911. A copy of relevant portions of provisional application Serial No. 60/277,911 was enclosed with Applicants' response dated January 17, 2006.

C. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 32, 50, 53, 65, 68, 126, 143, 154, 177, 202, 208, 229, 237, 241, 244, and 306 (including independent claims 1, 32, 53, 65, 68, 126, 143, 154, 177, 202, 208, 229, 237, 241, 244 and 306) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,287). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants point out that identical rejections of the above-identified claims were sustained in the previous Office Action dated November 16, 2005, to which the Applicants were fully responsive in their response dated January 17, 2006. Applicants respectfully reiterate that the present Office Action, like its predecessor, fails to clearly and concisely explain the grounds for rejecting *each* of Applicants' independent claims *based on the specific features recited in each independent claim*. Instead, the Office Action sets forth rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 of 16 different independent claims in a single brief paragraph. As discussed in detail below, the Office Action completely fails to specifically address the unique features associated with many of Applicants' claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections indicated in the Office Action are improper.

1. Discussion of Nagata

Nagata is directed to an image viewing device that is mounted on a user's face and permits the user to observe a virtual image on a display unit (col. 3, lines 21-30). Accordingly, while wearing such an image viewing device, a user's normal view of their surroundings is generally impeded. To account for this situation, Nagata discloses that small light sources

emitting light of a specific wavelength may be attached to various household items, or “accessories,” located within the immediate vicinity of the user to facilitate identification of the location of these objects (col. 2, lines 32-38).

More specifically, Nagata discloses that at least a part of the frame of the image viewing device is configured to allow the passage through the device of the specific wavelength of light corresponding to the light emitted by the light sources attached to objects or accessories. In this manner, the specific wavelength of light associated with the objects or accessories is visible to the user through the image viewing device mounted on the user’s face, and therefore indicates to the user the presence of an accessory in the vicinity without requiring the user to remove the image viewing device from the user’s face (col. 4, lines 13-17). In other embodiments (Nagata’s Figs. 9 and 10), Nagata provides additional light sources for illumination to enhance the specific wavelength of light that passes through the image viewing device and facilitates indication of an accessory or object in the user’s surroundings (col. 5, lines 30-35).

The system described in Nagata may extend to other applications, such as at video stores or at coffee shops where users may eat and drink freely during a viewing (co. 6, lines 14-20).

2. Independent Claims 1 and 177

Applicants’ claim 1 is directed to a method of providing illumination in coordination with a display screen. The method includes providing a source of computer application content for display on a display screen; providing an illumination source for illuminating an environment that is related to and beyond the display screen; and coordinating the illumination source to illuminate the environment in relationship to the computer application content on the display screen. Claim 177 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the language of independent method claim 1.

Nagata does not disclose or suggest the method and system of Applicants’ claims 1 and 177, respectively. In particular, Nagata completely fails to teach or suggest *coordinating the illumination source to illuminate the environment in relationship to the computer application content on the display screen.*

In Nagata, the light emanating from the light sources attached to accessories or enhanced light from an illuminating apparatus, and the content being viewed by the user on the image viewing device mounted on the user’s face, are not coordinated or related in any manner

whatsoever. The light sources attached to the accessories or the enhancing illuminating apparatus emanate static light; stated differently, so long as the light sources receive power (e.g., the accessories are plugged into their power source), the light sources continuously produce light of a specific wavelength solely for the purposes of indicating the location of an accessory, regardless of the existence or content of an image that is being displayed and viewed by the user on the image viewing device (col. 4, lines 17-24). Again, the light from the light sources and the viewing content on Nagata's image viewing device are completely unrelated.

Thus, Nagata fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature recited in claims 1 and 177 of coordinating the illumination source to illuminate the environment in relationship to the computer application content on the display screen. For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1 and 177 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1 and 177 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 to 25 and 178 to 201 depend from one of claims 1 and 177 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

3. Independent Claims 32 and 208

Applicants' claim 32 is directed to a method of providing a control signal for an illumination system. The method includes providing content for a computer application including a display on a computer screen; providing the control signal adapted to control an illumination system to generate at least one time-varying lighting effect; and coordinating generating the control signal such that the at least one time-varying lighting effect is coordinated with the content. Claim 208 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the language of independent method claim 32.

Nagata fails to disclose or suggest an illumination system that generates at least one time-varying lighting effect, as recited in claims 32 and 208. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62- 67). Nagata is completely silent with respect to any time-varying effects. Accordingly, claims 32 and 208 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 33 to 37 and 209 to 213 depend from one of claims 32 and 208 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

4. Independent Claims 53 and 229

Applicants' claim 53 is directed to a method of illumination in a virtual reality environment. The method includes providing a display screen for displaying virtual reality content in at least a portion of the virtual reality environment; providing a lighting system for illuminating at least a portion of the virtual reality environment beyond the display screen; and coordinating illumination from the lighting system with the virtual reality content beyond the display screen. Claim 229 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the language of independent method claim 53.

As discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 177, Nagata fails to disclose or suggest any feature relating to *illuminating at least a portion of the virtual reality environment beyond the display screen and coordinating illumination from the lighting system with the virtual reality content beyond the display screen*, as recited in claims 53 and 229. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62- 67). Nowhere in the reference does Nagata make any disclosure or suggestion that the light beam also may provide general ambient illumination in an environment around the display screen, nor does any coordination exist between the accessories and the contents displayed on the image viewing device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 53 and 229 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejections of claims 53 and 229 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 54 to 56 and 230 to 232 depend from one of claims 53 and 229 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

5. Independent Claims 65 and 241

Applicants' claim 65 is directed to a method of simulating an environment of a real world situation. The method includes establishing a simulated environment corresponding to an environment of the real world situation; providing a lighting system for illuminating the simulated environment; and controlling the lighting system to illuminate the simulated environment in a manner corresponding to illumination conditions typical of the real world environment. Claim 241 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the

language of independent method claim 65.

Nagata completely fails to disclose or suggest the method and system recited in claims 65 and 241, respectively. In particular, nowhere in the reference does Nagata disclose or suggest a lighting system to illuminate the simulated environment in a manner corresponding to illumination conditions typical of the real world environment. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62-67). For at least this reason, claims 65 and 241 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejections of claims 65 and 241 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 66 and 242 depend from claims 65 and 241, respectively, and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

6. Independent Claims 68 and 244

Applicants' claim 68 is directed to a method of illumination of an environment. The method includes providing a display screen for displaying content of a computer application; providing a lighting system for illuminating an environment of a user of the computer application with multi-color illumination; and providing a surface for receiving the multi-color illumination from the lighting system. The user perceives at least some of the multi-color illumination in the environment. The method also includes coordinating the multi-color illumination of the surface with execution of the content of the computer application. Claim 244 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the language of independent method claim 68.

As discussed above in connection with claims 26 and 202, Nagata fails to disclose or suggest any feature relating to illuminating an environment with multi-color illumination, as recited in claims 68 and 244. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62-67). For at least this reason, claims 68 and 244 patentably distinguish over Nagata and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 69, 245 and 246 depend from one of claims 68 and 244 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

7. Independent Claims 126 and 306

Applicants' claim 126 is directed to a method of facilitating illumination control. The method includes providing a control system for an illumination source configured to provide variable color light; adapting the control system to receive a signal representative of visual content displayed on a display screen; and adapting the control system to control the illumination source to generate the variable color light in coordination with the visual content. Claim 306 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that generally tracks the language of independent method claim 126.

For reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claims 26 and 202 (as well as claims 68 and 244), claims 126 and 306 are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 127 to 129 and 307 to 309 depend from one of claims 126 and 306 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

8. Independent Claim 143

Applicants' claim 143 is directed to a screen for use with a lighting system. The screen includes a frame designed to be placed in proximity to the a user of a computing system, and a material mounted on the frame. The material is arranged to reflect illumination produced by a the lighting system to such that the user of the computing system perceives the illumination in an ambient environment around the computing system.

Nagata completely fails to disclose or suggest the system recited in claim 143. In particular, nowhere in the reference does Nagata disclose or suggest a material mounted on the frame, much less, the material being *arranged to reflect illumination produced by a lighting system to such that the user of the computing system perceives the illumination in an ambient environment around the computing system*, as in Applicants' claim 143.

For at least this reason, claim 143 patentably distinguishes over Nagata and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 144 to 152 depend from claim 143 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

Response to Office Action dated 6/16/2006

12. Independent Claim 154

Applicant's claim 154 is directed to a method for visualizing relative locations of virtual objects within a virtual environment. The method includes providing a computing device and generating a virtual environment on the computing device. The virtual environment contains a plurality of virtual objects. The method also includes associating with at least one of the plurality of virtual objects the illumination from a lighting fixture; and visualizing the relative location of the virtual object by the positioning position of the illumination.

Nagata completely fails to disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 154. In particular, nowhere in the reference does Nagata disclose or suggest visualizing a relative location, much less the positioning of the illumination in accordance to the visualization of the relative location. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to an user (col. 1, lines 62- 67). For at least this reason, claim 154 patentably distinguish over Nagata and is in condition for allowance. The rejections of claim 154 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 155 to 157 depend from claim 154 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

13. Independent Claim 202

Applicants' claim 202 is directed to a system for illuminating an environment of a display screen. The system comprises an illumination source capable of illuminating the environment with a plurality of colors, and a control system for controlling the illumination source, wherein the control system accepts a signal related to content displayed on the display screen.

Nagata fails to disclose or suggest any feature relating to illuminating an environment with a plurality of colors, as recited in claim 202. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62- 67). Nagata is completely silent with respect to the light beam, or any other light source, being capable of illuminating anything with a plurality of colors. For at least this reason, claim 202 patentably distinguishes over Nagata and is in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejection of this claim as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 203 to 207 depend from claim 202 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

Applicants respectfully point out that claim 202 substantially tracks the language of independent method claim 26. However, independent method claim 26 was not similarly rejected as being allegedly anticipated by Nagata, but rather was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Nagata in view of Kenet, as discussed below in Section D. This situation reveals an apparent inconsistency with which the claims have been examined, and Applicants respectfully submit that this inconsistency underscores the impropriety of the rejections of these claims.

14. Independent Claim 237

Applicants' claim 237 is directed to a system for modeling, comprising a computer-based representation of a solid model in a virtual environment, the representation including a capability for modeling an effect of a light system on the solid model, and a controller for a light system, the controller adapted to control the light system to illuminate a solid model in a real environment in correspondence with the modeled effect of the light in the virtual environment.

Nagata completely fails to disclose or suggest the system recited in claim 237. In particular, nowhere in the reference does Nagata disclose or suggest a computer-based representation of a solid model in a virtual environment, let alone any of the remaining features recited in the claim. For at least this reason, claim 237 patentably distinguishes over Nagata and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, the rejection of claim 237 as allegedly being anticipated by Nagata should be withdrawn.

Claims 238 to 240 depend from claim 237 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

Applicants respectfully point out that claim 237 substantially tracks the language of independent method claim 61. However, independent method claim 61 was not similarly rejected as being allegedly anticipated by Nagata, but rather was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Nagata in view of Kenet, as discussed below in Section D. As discussed above, this situation reveals an apparent inconsistency with which the claims have been examined, and Applicants respectfully submit that this inconsistency underscores the impropriety of the rejections of these claims.

D. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2-25, 26-31, 33-37, 51-52, 54-56, 61-64, 71-92, 95-125, 127-129, 144-152, 155-157, 166-176, 178-201, 203-207, 209-213, 229-232, 238-240, 242, 245-246, 248-305, 307, 323, 335 and 337 (including independent claims 26, 61, 71, 166, 248, 323, 335 and 337) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Nagata in view of Kenet (U.S. Patent No. 5,475,364). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As set forth in MPEP §2143, three criteria must be met in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the cited reference(s) or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the cited reference(s) or to combine reference teachings (if multiple references are cited). Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. The teaching or suggestion to modify the reference(s) or to combine reference teachings, as well as the reasonable expectation of success, must both be found in the prior art and not based on Applicants' disclosure. Third, the prior art reference(s), when viewed as a whole, must teach or suggest all of the claimed features. Failure to meet any one of these criteria – a teaching or suggestion of all claim elements, a specific suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the prior art, and a reasonable expectation of success – is sufficient to render an obviousness rejection improper.

As discussed below, *none* of these three criteria is met in the rejections over the combination of Nagata and Kenet.

1. Discussion of Kenet

Kenet relates generally to a room monitoring and control system for use in buildings such as hotels, office complexes, apartments, and the like, in which heating and cooling systems as well as fire detection systems for the building may be automatically operated based on information that is obtained from the building environment on a room by room basis (Abstract; col. 1, line 13 – col. 4, line 45).

In Kenet, a room control unit 80 (e.g., see Kenet Figs. 1 and 2) is placed on a wall of a room and configured to monitor and control various room functions relating to occupancy and environmental conditions in the room (col. 7, lines 18-21). The room control unit includes multiple LEDs to indicate the status of various functions performed by the control unit, such as

unit on-off, heating on-off, cooling on-off, and temperature selection (col. 7, lines 23-34; Figs. 4 and 5, reference numerals 90, 94, 98, 102). The room control unit also may include or be connected to one or more sensors for determining various conditions in the room, such as doors open-closed, occupancy via infrared motion sensing, ambient light level, temperature, presence of smoke, and the like (col. 7, line 34 – col. 8, line 67).

Kenet's room control unit 80 also is connected to a panel outside of the room that can be operated by a maid or other authorized person to interrogate the room control unit as to whether or not the room is occupied (col. 9, lines 1-6). If a person is present in the room, a red LED on the panel flashes for a short period of time, and if there is no person in the room, then a green LED on the panel glows continuously for the same period of time (col. 9, lines 7-10). The indication of room occupancy is useful for room cleaning applications as well as various emergency situations (e.g., fire or other evacuation situations) in which it is important to determine the presence of one or more people in the room (col. 17, line 55 – col. 25, line 18; Fig. 20).

It should be readily appreciated from the foregoing brief summary, as well as a detailed review of the entirety of Kenet's disclosure, that the LEDs employed by Kenet are in no way intended to generally illuminate an environment. Rather, Kenet's LEDs are employed specifically to provide an indication as to the status of various conditions associated with a room. Accordingly, as such, it should also be readily appreciated that for Kenet's LEDs to perform any useful function, they must be able to be perceived by an observer; i.e., if one cannot actually observe the light output of the LED, then they cannot ascertain the status of the condition represented by the LED.

2. The Combination of Nagata and Kenet is Improper

As discussed above in Section C1, Nagata is directed to an image viewing device that is mounted on a user's face. While wearing Nagata's image viewing device, *a user's normal view of their surroundings is generally impeded*. It is difficult to imagine a device that is more ill-suited to the environment in which the teachings of Kenet are implemented; objectively speaking, one of skill in the art simply would not contemplate a situation in which a person would be wearing Nagata's image viewing device while at the same time trying to observe

Kenet's LEDs so as to obtain status information from Kenet's room control system in a building such as a hotel, office complex, apartment, or the like.

Nagata discloses that only light within a very specific wavelength is able to pass through Nagata's image viewing device. However, there is no disclosure in either Nagata or Kenet that the indicator LEDs of Kenet's room control system or exterior panel provide light having the specific wavelength required in Nagata. Accordingly, in considering the respective teachings of these references as a whole, there is absolutely no motivation to combine any teachings from these references; in fact, several salient aspects of the respective teachings of Nagata and Kenet are arguably antithetical to each other.

Furthermore, as discussed further below, each of the independent claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 includes at least one feature that is entirely missing from both Nagata and Kenet. Accordingly, no combination of teachings from these references can render these claims obvious. For at least the foregoing reasons, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

3. Independent Claim 26

Applicants' claim 26 is directed to a method of illumination. The method includes providing an illumination source capable of illuminating an environment with a plurality of colors; providing a control system for controlling the illumination source; and configuring the control system to accept a signal related to content displayed on a display screen.

Both Nagata and Kenet fail to disclose or suggest any feature relating to illuminating an environment with a plurality of colors, as recited in claim 26. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user (col. 1, lines 62-67). Nagata is completely silent with respect to the light beam, or any other light source, being capable of illuminating anything with a plurality of colors. Similarly, Kenet merely teaches providing a number of LED indicators on a control unit or wall panel for indicating the status of various conditions associated with a room; again, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kenet that the LED indicators are capable of providing any significant illumination of an environment. Moreover, neither Nagata nor Kenet discloses or suggests in any matter that a control system for controlling the illumination source is configured to accept a signal related to content displayed on a display screen. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Nagata and Kenet and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 27 to 31 depend from claim 26 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

4. Independent Claim 61

Applicants' claim 61 is directed to a method of modeling. The method includes providing a computer-based representation of a solid model in a virtual environment. The representation includes a capability for modeling an effect of light illuminating the solid model. The method also includes providing a controller for a light system. The controller is adapted to control the light system to illuminate the solid model in a real environment in correspondence with the modeled effect of the light in the virtual environment.

Both Nagata and Kenet completely fail to disclose or suggest the method recited in claim 61. In particular, nowhere in either reference does Nagata or Kenet disclose or suggest a computer-based representation of a solid model in a virtual environment, let alone any of the remaining features recited in this claim. For at least this reason, claim 61 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Nagata and Kenet and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 62 to 64 depend from claim 61 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

5. Independent Claims 71 and 248

Applicants' claim 71 is directed to a method of controlling illumination in an environment of a visual display screen. The method includes providing an illumination source for producing illumination comprising a plurality of colors; obtaining a signal related to content displayed on the display screen; providing a control system for controlling the illumination source; and controlling the illumination source to illuminate the environment in coordination with the content displayed on the display screen. Claim 248 is an independent apparatus (system) claim that closely tracks the language of independent method claim 71.

For reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 26, claims 71 and 248 are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 72 to 92, 95 to 125, and 249 to 305 depend from one of claims 71 and 248 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

Response to Office Action dated 6/16/2006

6. Independent Claim 166

Applicant's claim 166 is directed to a method of providing illumination in coordination with display of content on a display screen. The method includes providing a source of displaying computer game content for display on a the display screen; and providing an illumination source for illuminating an environment that is related to the display screen. The illumination source is adapted to generate a plurality of colors. The method also includes providing a control system for controlling the illumination source to provide illumination of a plurality of colors; and coordinating the illumination source to illuminate the environment in relationship to the computer game content on the display screen. The coordination the illumination source uses the control system in response to a signal obtained from the a computer game.

As discussed above in connection with claim 26, both Nagata and Kenet fail to disclose or suggest any feature relating to illuminating an environment with multi-color illumination, as recited in claim 166. Rather, Nagata merely teaches providing a light source on an object in order to indicate its presence to a user, and Kenet merely discloses LEDs as status indicators for a room control system. Furthermore, both Nagata and Kenet also are completely silent with respect to coordinating an illumination source to illuminate the environment in relationship to computer game content on a display screen. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 166 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Nagata and Kenet and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 167 to 176 depend from claim 166 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

7. Claims 323-341

Independent claim 323 is directed to a method implemented in a computing device for extending the feel of a screen display to a housing that surrounds the screen display. The method comprises sampling a plurality of regions of the screen display to acquire color indicators for the plurality of regions, and changing the color of one or more regions of the housing based on the color indicators of one or more sampled regions of the screen display in order to extend the feel of the screen display to the housing that surrounds the screen display.

Independent claim 335 is directed to a method of extending the feel of a display screen to a housing that surrounds the display screen, the housing being separated into a plurality of independent illuminable zones, each of the zones having a light element that is disposed inside the housing in the area of the illuminable zone. The method comprises: associating regions of the display screen to particular illuminable zones; determining color indicators for a plurality of regions on the screen display that are associated with the illuminable zones; and illuminating the illuminable zones of the housing based on the color indicators of the regions associated therewith, the illumination being provided by light from the light element of the particular illuminable zone, the illumination colorizing the illuminable zone of the housing in conjunction with the color of the associated region of said extending the feel of said display screen.

Independent claim 337 is directed to a method for illuminating a housing of a computing system, the computing system having a screen display. The method comprises: providing illuminable regions to the housing around and adjacent the screen display; mapping illuminable regions of the housing to regions of the screen display; sampling regions of the screen display to acquire color indicators; and colorizing the illuminable regions of the housing in accordance with the acquired color indicators mapped thereto in order to extend the feel of the screen display to the housing, said colorizing including illuminating the illuminable regions with light from one or more light elements located at each of the illuminable regions of the housing.

There is absolutely no teaching in Nagata or Kenet, alone or in combination, of **any** feature recited in claims 323, 335, 337. It is particularly noteworthy that the Office Action completely fails to mention any of the features recited in these claims, and points to no teaching or suggestion whatsoever in any of the cited references with respect to the features of these claims. Accordingly, independent claims 323, 335 and 337 patentably distinguish over the combination of Nagata and Kenet, and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 324, 336, and 338-341 depend from one of claims 323, 335 and 337 and are allowable based at least upon their dependency.

E. General Comments on Dependent Claims

Since each of the dependent claims depends from a base claim that is believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that it is unnecessary at this time to argue the allowability of each of the dependent claims individually. However, Applicants do not

necessarily concur with the interpretation of the dependent claims as set forth in the Office Action, nor do Applicants concur that the basis for the rejection of any of the dependent claims is proper. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to specifically address the patentability of the dependent claims in the future, if deemed necessary.

F. Other Matters

Applicants note that, in connection with the Office Action Summary sheet, there is no indication with respect to the drawings in item 10. Formal drawings were filed in the present application on July 11, 2002. Accordingly, Applicants would appreciate an indication of the status of the drawings.

Also, in connection with items 13 and 14 of the Office Action Summary sheet, there is no acknowledgement of any priority claims in the present application; however, indeed the present application claims priority to several applications. Accordingly, appropriate acknowledgement for priority claims is respectfully requested.

Finally, on page 2 of the previous Office Action dated November 16, 2005, the Examiner rejected Applicant's IDS of May 18, 2004, for allegedly failing to provide a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document, non-patent literature publication or other information which caused it to be listed. In Applicants' previous response dated January 17, 2005, Applicants noted that the only two cited references in the IDS of May 18, 2004 are issued U.S. patents. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.98(1), Applicants are not required to provide a copy of U.S. patent references. Accordingly, Applicants requested appropriate acknowledgement for the IDS submitted on May 18, 2004, but to date have not received such acknowledgement. Applicants again request the Examiner to acknowledge the May 18, 2004 IDS as being fully compliant and review of the references cited therein.

G. Conclusion

In general, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment set forth in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

Furthermore, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number indicated below to discuss any outstanding issues relating to the allowability of the application.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825, reference C1104.70087US00.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 16, 2006

By / Joseph Teja, Jr. /
Joseph Teja, Jr.
Registration No.: 45,157
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000